DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 254 CE 042 491

AUTHOR Hogue, Ken; And Others
TITLE Evaluation of Employer, Teacher, and Student Perceptions of CO-OP/PEL. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Texas A and M Univ., College Station.
SPONS AGENCY Texas Education Agency, Austin. Dept. of Occupational Education and Technology.
PUB DATE Jul 85
NOTE 64p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Education; *Employer Attitudes; Graduate Surveys; Job Skills; *Laboratory Training; On the Job Training; *Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Simulation; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; Vocational Education; Vocational Education Teachers

ABSTRACT

A study compared the effectiveness of on-the-job work experience (CO-OP) with pre-employment laboratory experience (PEL) of the six instructional areas in vocational education. This was accomplished by obtaining the perceptions of program completers (1983 graduates), participating employers, and vocational education teachers from seven sample school districts across Texas. Three individual survey instruments were constructed to collect information from the three sample groups using personal and telephone interview techniques. Data were entered into the Statistical Analysis System for data processing and analysis. Findings indicated that combination PEL/CO-OP seems to be the most effective strategy for preparing students for entry-level employment. Existing and continuing support from employers has been established, since the majority feel that the vocational education programs are adequately preparing students for entry-level employment. (The three instruments are appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED261254

Evaluation of Employer, Teacher, and Student Perceptions of CO-OP/PEL

FINAL REPORT PREPARED BY
KEN HOGUE
MARILYNN GROSSMAN
DORIS SPIEGEL

SPONSORED COOPERATIVELY BY
RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

and

OCCUPATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM
INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L Kemp
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JULY, 1985

The project reported herein was performed through a contract with the Texas Education Agency under the provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482). Contractees undertaking such projects are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Texas Education Agency position or policy.

CE 042 491

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to compare the effectiveness of on-the-job work experience (CO-OP) with pre-employment laboratory experience (PEL) of the six instructional areas in vocational education. This was accomplished by obtaining the perceptions of program completers (1983 graduates), participating employers and vocational education teachers from seven sample school districts across the state. Three individual survey instruments were constructed and used to collect information from the 3 sample groups using personal and telephone interview techniques. The data was entered into the Statistical Analysis System (SAS), an integrated data management and package, for data processing and analysis.

The findings disclosed that combination PEL/CO-OP seems to be the most effective strategy for preparing students for entry-level employment. Existing and continuing support from employers has been established as the majority feel that the vocational education programs are adequately preparing students for entry-level employment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
Statement of Need	2
Literature Review	3
Definition of Terms	6
Goals and Objectives	8
Selection of Sample	9
Development of Survey Instrument and Forms	11
Evaluation Procedures and Findings	12
Collection of Data	14
General Methodology	14
Employer Data Collection	15
Teacher Data Collection	15
Student Data Collection	16
Presentation of Data	17
Presentation of Employer Data	17
Presentation of Teacher Data	20
Presentation of Student Data	21
Interpretation of Data	25
Interpretation of Employer Data	25
Interpretation of Teacher Data	28
Interpretation of Student Data	29
Conclusions	34
References	38
Appendix A Employer Survey	40
Appendix B Teacher Survey	41
Appendix C Student Survey	42

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Number of Years Employers Have Hired CO-OP Students	17
2	Number of Students Employed Last 5 Years	18
3	Number of Students on Job After Graduation	18
4	Employers' Comparison of CO-OP and Non-CO-OP Students for Individual Personality and Job Factors	19
5	Reasons for Employers' Involvement in Cooperative Training Programs	20
6	Students' Traits in Relation to Type of Teaching Strategy	21
7	Program Verification Data	22
8	New Skills Learned Since Vocational Training	22
9	Post High School Educational Activities	23
10	Effectiveness of Vocational Training in Preparation for Job	23

INTRODUCTION

The national education reform movement precipitated by the National Commission on Excellence in Education has been considered by vocational educators such as Gordon I. Swanson (1984) and others as having neglected vocational education. Former Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell addressed this concern in his article "Vocational Education and the Education Reform Movement" (1984, pp. 33-34). Among the primary reasons for the importance of vocational education as part of the nation's overall educational systems were ". . . of its role in preparing young men and women to enter the labor market, but also because it is a major, integral component of the American education system . . ." (p. 33). In addition, due to the many challenges of change and competition in the world market place and the accelerated pace of technological changes, vocational education has the opportunity to meet these challenges of change in providing skilled workers who will have the competencies to cope in this new world of constant change.

Historically vocational education in Texas has received local state support that predates the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. HB72 is part of the greater fallout from the National Commission's report A Nation at Risk (1983) and specifically Governor White's Select Committee on Education. Vocational education has been thrown the gauntlet to keep up with the changes referred to by Secretary Bell. The present study will help provide vocational education with important information so programs can be strengthened in meeting the challenge of change.

STATEMENT OF NEED

Emerging technology, shifts in population, and changes in occupational opportunities have created a concern about the way students are educationally prepared to fit into the job market. This concern has had and will have some effect on the way vocational education is viewed and taught in Texas. The strategies used to implement vocational training and the expectations of those involved in vocational training are receiving a great deal of attention. Does vocational education do the job it was designed to do? Are students' expectations realistic? Are vocational teachers adequately prepared? Just how efficient are the CO-OP and Pre-employment laboratory teaching strategies? These and other questions are being asked by educators, legislators and other concerned citizens. Some of the answers are very hard if not impossible to determine. In an attempt to answer some of these questions this project was funded by the Research Coordinating Unit of the Texas Education Agency (TEA).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The body of literature in vocational education and training is vast. A recent (September, 1984) Automatic Information Retrieval Service (AIRS) search resulted in more than 15,000 listings dealing with pre-employment laboratory (PEL) and cooperative (CO-OP) education in the six basic instructional areas. The final listing when searched for perceptions with these resulted in 181 abstracts retrieved for purposes of the study. A comprehensive study of these revealed few that specifically addressed the nature of this study. Most studies dealt with cooperative programs in Vocational Office Education (VOE) and Distributive Education (DE).

Grusy (1975) compared whether the approach in preparation for the VOE two year combination training (PEL/CO-OP) program was superior for students with those who completed traditional business courses prior to their participation in the CO-OP phase of the program. His findings revealed that there was no difference in the job competencies or attitudes of students "who completed laboratory training in preparation for cooperative training with students who completed traditional business courses" (p. iv).

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education conducted a study (1984) to describe and analyze how employers respond to information presented to them on application forms for entry-level jobs. Results confirmed that employers tended to give preference to participants in relevant cooperative or experimental type educational programs.

Zimmer (1968) identified the factor that distinguished the on-the-job work experience programs (CO-OP) from merely "working at a job" as the role played by the teacher-coordinator. In citing Zimmer, Grusy stated, "The teacher- coordinator insures that students are assigned to a place of employment compatible with their

career objectives, and in so far as possible, with their personality traits. After placement, the teacher-coordinator makes herself available for guidance, counseling and assistance to both the student and employer." (p. 37)

Houstman's unpublished doctoral dissertation studied The future of Vocational Office and Distributive Education as perceived by state supervisors and teacher educators (1972). The study was conducted to determine and compare the perceptions of state supervisors and teachers in these two program areas. The results indicated that these persons (representative of each of the fifty states) considered cooperative education as the most effective means for students to gain occupational competence.

Brockman (1972) conducted a follow-up study of cooperative work experience participants 26-40 years later in Lewiston, Montana based on the review of the literature at that time which suggested that the immediate affects of cooperative work experience may not always be apparent in job competencies alone. The study reported detecting that the greatest value of work experience was in human relations and the assistance it provided in making vocational choices.

A study was conducted by The National Center for Research in Vocational Education of Youth's perceptions of employer standards: Effects on employment outcomes and employer evaluations (1984) one aspect of which looked at the "Effects of secondary school programs on perceptions and outcomes: (p. 22). Some of the findings to this portion of the study revealed a "net effect for school program on employment outcomes, . . . , was significant only for vocational students who received the highest hourly wage in the year following high school. Although not significantly correlated, both vocational and college preparatory majors were evaluated more highly by their employers than non-program youth in the year following graduation." (p. 22).

Although a plethora of studies exist for cooperative work-experience there is a paucity in the literature regarding pre-employment laboratory experiences and/or combination training strategies across the six vocational instructional areas in relation to follow-up of student completers, employers and teachers.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Combination, Pre-employment (PEL) and Cooperative Education (CO-OP)
An organization of instruction which combines two vocational instructional techniques (i.e., pre-employment laboratory and cooperative education; production agriculture and pre-employment laboratory; homemaking education and home economics cooperative education; homemaking education and home economics pre-employment laboratory education; and, home economics cooperative education and home economics pre-employment laboratory education). (Borman, Colson, Cox & Herring, 1981, p. 51)

Cooperative Vocational Education
Cooperative education is a method of instruction for vocational education programs for persons who, through written cooperative arrangements between the school and employers, receive instruction, including required academic courses and related vocational instruction, by alternation of study in school with a job in any occupational field. (Texas Education Agency [TEA], 1983, p. 200).

Instructional Program
A program of instruction designed to prepare individuals for paid or unpaid employment in a specific occupation which is especially and particularly suited to the needs and interests of those engaged in or preparing to engage in the occupations. (TEA, 1983, p. 200).

Perceptions
Personal awareness and interpretations of past experiences.

Pre-employment laboratory (PEL)
An organization of instruction designed to provide technical instruction, practical experience, and simulated work experience in the classroom and especially equipped laboratory. The indepth skill building program is designed to result in entry-level skill performance. (Borman et al., 1981, p. 51).

Program Completer

A student who has finished a required sequence of courses, services, or activities designed to meet an occupational objective. (TEA, 1983, p. 201). For this project, the person will have graduated from high school.

Teacher-coordinator

A member of the school staff who teaches, coordinates and administers the work experience program (PEL, CO-OP, PEL/CO-OP) with the technical subject matter in the field of vocational expertise and has been certified for that teaching position. (American Vocational Association, 1968, p. 6).

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This project was intended to address the following major objectives:

1. To compare "on-job" work experiences with pre-employment laboratory experiences.
2. To determine the extent to which former vocational students perceive the usefulness of the knowledge and skills obtained in the practical experience part of vocational education in their first employment and in subsequent employment.
3. To compare employers' perceptions of students who receive practical experience through pre-employment laboratory and "on-job" work experience.
4. To compare perceptions of employability and career potential of students in three categories: PEL, CO-OP, PEL/CO-OP.

The employers' knowledge of pre-employment laboratory training was quite limited. Therefore, objective #3 as stated above, was revised somewhat. (Additional reference to this problem is located in "Evaluation Procedures and Findings" page 12)

SELECTION OF SAMPLE

This project was designed to compare the effectiveness of on-the-job work experiences (CO-OP) with pre-employment laboratory experiences (PEL) of the six instructional areas in vocational education in Texas. This was accomplished by obtaining the perceptions of program completers (1983 graduates), participating employers and vocational teachers from seven sample school districts across the state. The districts of El Paso, Harlingen, Houston, Lubbock, Mesquite, North East (San Antonio) and Tyler were selected since they are representative of a cross section of populations and geographic locations. Brownsville ISD withdrew from the project on Octoboer 30, 1984. At the time they were involved in two major district wide undertakings that precluded their participation in this project.

Harlingen ISD agreed to participate in the project on November 8, 1984. An invitation to participate was sent from the Associate Commissioner of Occupational Education and Technology, TEA, to the Superintendent of Schools, Harlingen ISD on Decemeber 7, 1984.

Initially, vocational directors from the sample school districts were asked to supply names and phone numbers of 1983 program completers, and names, addresses and phone numbers of employers who had participated in CO-OP training for a minimum of two years. Directors were provided with color coded blank forms on which to record this information.

To obtain an optimal sample size, vocational directors were asked to identify all 1983 completers per instructional program area and type of training received. Of particular help in determining the estimate for the individual school district sample size was the 1982-83 Secondary Program Enrollment Reports provided by the TEA Department of Occupational Education and Technology. These listed

the number of student completers in each vocational program area for the high schools within the participating school districts. The projected random sample size was to be a maximum of 12 completers per instructional area or the total population if less than 12.

The same concept was applied for obtaining a random sample within each category of employers resulting in a stratified random sample for each set of populations. The request for total list of students and employers from each of the districts was necessary in order to eliminate the concern for sample bias. However, the selection of the teacher sample was left to the vocational directors in order to minimize intrusion upon teachers time from their instructional efforts.

DEVELOPMENT OF SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND FORMS

Three survey instruments were developed - student, employer and teacher - to be used for interviewing in person and by phone.

The employer survey instrument was designed to be used in person and by telephone. (See Appendix A, page 40) A telephone script was incorporated with the actual instrument. All narrative script was printed in capital letters. This insured consistency by all interviewers. The format for the majority of questions was objective, close-ended. This aided in coding and data entry procedures. An "Employer Questionnaire Summary" was developed to be sent with a cover letter to employers. Its purpose was effective in introducing the project and preparing employers for the forthcoming telephone or personal interview. The letter/summary was followed by a telephone call to set up a day and time for the telephone or personal interview.

The teacher survey was designed for personal interviewing. (See Appendix B, page 41) Where there were more than three responses per question, flash cards with appropriate answer choices were shown to the respondent. Not only did the interview take less time, but the flash cards also helped to relieve the anxiety sometimes characteristic of interviewees.

The student survey instrument was designed to be used specifically by telephone. (See Appendix C, page 42) It is for that reason that an accompanying telephone script was incorporated with the instrument itself. The questions were similar in format to those of the employer survey. Several questions, specifically those dealing with perceptions, were open-ended in an effort to draw out additional information from the student. All forms were approved by TEA prior to use. Review by the advisory committee and results of a pilot test aided in developing the final form of the survey instruments.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS

An advisory committee was formed of individuals from business and industry representing the six instructional program areas. Members with educational expertise included a district superintendent, vocational administrator and a vocational supervisor/instructor. Contact was made with members by phone and mail in which all were appraised of the project objectives and major activities. Specficially, the advisory committee was asked to evaluate the survey instruments prior to utilization for the pilot test.

Advisory committee members were sent a copy of each instrument and an accompanying evaluation form. The format of the form required the evaluator to rate the relevancy of the survey questions to the project objectives, wording for clarity and to reduce bias, and the systematic organization of the questions.

An 89% return rate of evaluation forms from advisory committee members indicated that evaluators thought the instruments were appropriate for obtaining information relevant to the project objectives. Some minor changes were noted and comments concerning additional questions to be asked were evaluated for consistency in meeting project objectives.

Survey instruments were modified as indicated from the results of the advisory committee evaluation. The instruments were then pilot tested in College Station ISD by interviewing a sample of students, employers and teachers. The pilot test revealed that employers were not familiar with the term "pre-employment laboratory". Therefore, they were unable to compare the skills of employees who had PEL with those who had CO-OP (Project Objective #3). To address this issue in a similar manner, familiar to employers, they were asked to compare employees who had CO-OP

training with those who did not (Non-CO-OP). Following the pilot test, minor changes were made on the employer, teacher and student instruments. For the most part, these represented revisions in the order and the wording of the questions.

Staff from the Research Coordinating Unit of TEA approved the format of the survey instruments on December 17, 1984.

COLLECTION OF DATA

General Methodology:

To encourage cooperation from the seven sample school districts and participating employers, a communication campaign was developed. An initial, introductory letter (August 30, 1984) was sent from the Associate Commissioner for Occupational Education and Technology, Texas Education Agency, to the superintendents of the seven sample school districts. Its purpose was to elicit support from them and inform them of the type of data to be collected. Copies of this letter were forwarded to the vocational directors.

On October 24, 1984, a letter was sent from project staff to all participating vocational directors asking them to provide lists of 1983 program completers and participating employers. Within one week of the receipt of the letter, each vocational director was contacted by phone to ensure there were no misunderstandings about the kind of information needed.

Following receipt of the information from the school districts, employers were sent letters requesting their participation in the project. Enclosed with the letter was a summary of the questionnaire to be used during the interview. Employers were contacted within one week of receipt of the letter to set up a date and time to conduct a personal or telephone interview. A random sample of the total employer sample (6-8 per district) was selected for personal interviews for the added dimension of face-to-face communication. One week prior to the personal interview a letter of confirmation and the questionnaire summary were again mailed.

The remainder of the employers were interviewed by telephone. Most employers were very candid in their responses using either method of data collection. All employers appreciated the "advanced warning" concerning their participation in the project.

All sampled teachers were interviewed in person by a project staff member. It was determined that personal interviews with teachers was logistically sound as project staff members would be visiting the districts for employer interviews. Vocational directors scheduled teachers for interviews at a central location.

Students were randomly selected from the lists provided by vocational directors and interviewed by phone. The rationale to perform all student interviews by phone was based on the consideration of turn around time. It seemed to be the most viable alternative for contacting a large, disperse, possible transient sample.

Just prior to the commencement of data collection, an in-service training session was held for all interviewers in the use of the respective telephone interview instruments. Interviewers practiced with each other and participants in the pilot study.

As data was collected it was recorded on individual survey instruments. The instruments were then coded and data entered into the computer. Each instrument was given its own file number.

Employer Data Collection

A total of 337 completed questionniares were obtained for the employer sample from the seven school districts. If, after three attempts, an employer could not be reached, (i.e., in a meeting, at lunch, too busy, out of town) then no further attempts were made to contact him/her. Most of the employer information forwarded by the school districts was current which resulted in few disconnects and/or wrong numbers.

Teacher Data Collection

A total of 39 teachers were interviewed on-site within the seven sample school districts. The response from Tyler was low because of problems in scheduling; there happpened to be a teacher's in-service scheduled for the same day the project staff person was visiting the area.

Student Data Collection

A total of 226 completed questionnaires for the student sample were obtained. This number is depressed due to the many difficulties encountered in conducting the telephone follow-up. For example, a typical class list of 42 names resulted in ten phone numbers that were either disconnected or wrong numbers; nine calls were call backs for which a minimum of three trials were made; one student was attending a college out-of-town; eleven calls were no answers (N/A) for a minimum of three attempted tries; and twelve were completed of which five required two or more attempted calls. A total of 95 calls were made in order to obtain a sample of 12. Lists containing seven names resulted in obtaining proportionately fewer completions. The attempted trials held constant for wrong numbers and/or disconnects, call backs and N/A for all districts and across instructional programs.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Presentation of Employer Data

The data presented here were collected from employers, teachers, and students using the forms located in Appendices A, B, and C. All data is reported as totals for the seven school districts unless otherwise indicated. All percentages have been rounded off to the nearest tenth value.

The data in Table 1 shows the number of years participating employers have hired high school CO-OP students. Of the total number of employers surveyed, 60.2% have hired CO-OP for more than five years.

Table 1
Number of Years
Employers Have Hired CO-OP Students
n = 337

Number of Years	Percent of Employers
1	5.3%
2	5.3
3	11.3
4	7.2
5	9.8
More than 5	60.2

Table 2 indicates the number of CO-OP students hired in the last 5 years by participating employers. 43.5% of employers hired between 0 and 5 CO-OP students during the past 5 years, and 24% hired between 6 and 10 CO-OP students.

Table 2

Number of Students Employed Last 5 Years
n = 337

Number of Students	Percent of Employers Hiring in this Range
0 - 5	43.5%
6 - 10	24.0
11 - 15	13.7
16 - 20	5.3
21 - 25	2.7
26 - 35	2.7
36 - 45	2.1
46 - 55	2.1
56 - 100	4.2

The number of students staying on as regular employees with their CO-OP employer after graduation is indicated in Table 3. Nearly 84% of the employers stated that they keep between 0 and 5 of their CO-OP students.

Table 3
Number of Students on Job After Graduation
n = 337

Number of Students	Percent of Employers Hiring Students as Regular Employees
0 - 5	83.7%
6 - 10	8.9
11 - 15	2.7
16 - 20	0.9
21 - 25	3.6

Employers who had hired non-CO-OP graduates were asked to compare their entry-level skills with those of the CO-OP student. Of the employers surveyed 47.5% had hired non-CO-OP graduates. Of those, 27.3% said that the CO-OP student had better skills than the entry-level non-CO-OP graduate; 16.3% replied that the skill levels of both groups were the same.

Table 4 demonstrates the employers' comparison of CO-OP and non-CO-OP students for individual personality traits and job factors. Employers were asked to compare individual entry level personality traits and job skills of two employees who do the same work -- one who has had CO-OP training and one who has not. They were to respond by indicating which one performed better or if there was no difference between the two. In all factors the employee who had CO-OP training was rated highest with the exception of safety; 51.6% of the employers felt there was no distinguishable difference (NDD) between CO-OP and non-CO-OP employees where safety was concerned. The percentage of employers' responses is categorized under the heading CO-OP, Non-CO-OP, NDD (no distinguishable difference).

TABLE 4
Employers' Comparison of CO-OP and Non-CO-OP
Students For Individual Personality And Job Factors
n = 337

	CO-OP	NON-CO-OP	NDD *
Job Knowledge	51.6%	2.1%	33.5% **
Quality Of Work Performed	56.4	3.3	27.6
Dependability	55.8	4.4	27.3
Work Output	46.0	2.7	38.9
Communication Skills	46.0	5.6	36.2
Proper Use Of Facilities, Tools, And Equipment	48.4	3.9	35.3
Cooperativeness	47.5	2.1	37.7
Willingness To Learn	56.1	1.5	29.7
Level Of Supervision Required	43.3	7.4	36.2
Safety	33.2	1.2	51.6

* No distinguishable difference
** Rows do not total 100% since 12.6% of the employers did not respond to this question

Data in Table 5 presents reasons for the employers' involvement in cooperative programs. Employers were asked to state 3 reasons for their participation in the programs.

Table 5
Reasons For Employers' Involvement in
Cooperative Training Programs
n = 337

Reasons	Percent of Total Responses
Availability of qualified help	48.1%
Provides a valuable community service	46.9
Provides a valuable source for potential employees	32.6
Reduced wage expense	19.6
Cost of recruiting new employees is reduced	15.7
Is good for public relations	8.9
Improves communications with school	8.6
Former CO-OP students demonstrate a more positive sense of responsibility to the organization	6.5
Makes school more responsive to the needs of business	6.5
Provides a valuable source for potential employees	32.6
Other	68.8

Only those reasons categorized as "OTHER" which received 20 o. more responses were to be tabulated. Since reasons, other than those listed, were so disperse, the "OTHER" category was not tabulated.

When asked about major obstacles to participating in CO-OP programs 57.6% of the employers felt there were none. Of all employers surveyed 97.0% said they would like to continue to be involved in CO-OP training.

Presentation of Teacher Data

Personal interviews of vocational teachers were conducted by project staff members at each of the participating school districts for a total of 39 teacher interviews completed.

Teachers indicated that the most effective type of training for preparing students for entry-level employment was combination PEL/CO-OP - 48.7%; CO-OP - 43.6%; and PEL - 7.7%.

Approximately 71.0% of the teachers strongly agreed that the employer is a partner in the cooperative education endeavor and can offer advice and suggestions for important changes or needed innovations in curriculum.

Table 6 presents the results of student traits in relation to type of teaching strategy as perceived by teachers.

Table 6
Students' Traits in Relation to Type of Teaching Strategy
n = 39

	CO-OP	PEL	CO-OP/PEL
Show interest in school	20.5%	12.8	64.1
Have mature attitudes toward work	71.8	5.1	23.1
Are more certain of career goals	59.0	5.1	33.3

The two most frequent measures used for assessing program effectiveness by teachers were: 73.5% feedback from former students, and 64.7% feedback from employers.

Presentation of Student Data

A total of 226 interviews were completed for the student sample. Several questions were asked to verify the program data provided by the school districts. The responses provided data for type of training - CO-OP, PEL or PEL/CO-OP and identification of instrucational program area.

Table 7

Program Verification Data
n = 226

Type of Training	
CO-OP	62.0 %
PEL	8.0
PEL/CO-OP	30.0
Instructional Program Areas	
AG	5.8
HECE	20.4
HO	15.0
M/DE	17.2
T & I	14.6
VOE	27.0

Current and recent past employment history were obtained with 66% respondents currently employed in the same field as their vocational training and 27% in a different field for a total of 93% employed. Of these 57% were employed full time; 30% employed part-time, and 13% not applicable.

Data was collected relating to students' skills learned on the job since learning in school (past); follow-up data was obtained in relation to any additional training presently being received for the job. (See Table 8)

Table 8
New Skills Learned Since
Vocational Training
n=226

	Past	Present
Yes	76%	19%
No	20	76
N/A	4	5

Post high school educational participation was addressed. Approximately 50% indicated that they were currently involved in educational activities. Thirty percent were enrolled as full-time students at a post-secondary institution and 20.0% were part-time students (See Table 9). Two students reported as currently involved in a CO-OP program at a college. Four completers were reported in the military as reported by parent(s).

Table 9
Post High School Educational Activities
n=226

Full-time	30.1%
Part-time	19.5
Type of Institution	
4 year	19.0
2 year	19.0
Technical	6.0
Other	6.0

The interviewees were asked to respond to a five point scale in relation to their vocational training preparation:

Table 10
Effectiveness of Vocational Training in Preparation for Job
n = 226

Preparation	
Excellent	29.0
Above Average	36.0
Average	31.0
Below Average	2.0
Poor	.44
No Answer	2.0

Students were asked if they would recommend PEL, CO-OP or Combination to other high school students. The responses were 98% yes and 2% no. Some sample responses were: "It was good preparation and allowed me to earn money so I could remain in school; I was interested in pursuing a career in the field; I learned alot about getting along with others."

INTREPRETATION OF DATA

Interpretation of Employer Data

Of the employers surveyed 60.2% have hired CO-OP students for more than 5 years, as shown in Table 1 on page 17. This indicates that the majority of employers responding have ample knowledge of and experience with CO-OP students and their respective cooperative training programs. This coupled with the 97% who said they would like to continue to participate in CO-OP programs, is a strong indication of the employers' positive feelings about the programs. As employers perceive it, CO-OP programs are meeting their needs.

Table 2 (page 18) and Table 3 (page 18) present the number of CO-OP students hired by employers in the last 5 years and the number staying on as regular employees, respectively. Forty-three and five-tenths percent (43.5%) employed between 0 and 5 CO-OP students and 24.0% hired between 6 and 10 for a total of 67.5% hiring up to 10 CO-OP students in 5 years. This may be perceived as minimal participation on the part of the employers. However, 61.7% of the employers surveyed had less than 25 employees working for them; 37.4% had less than 10 employees. It would appear that hiring 1-2 CO-OP students per year is reasonable for the size of the majority of training stations surveyed. Similarly, the number of CO-OP students staying on as regular employees is in line with the size of the training station. The high percentage (83.7%) of employers retaining 0-5 CO-OP students as regular employees (in 5 years) after graduation should not be considered as negative.

In comparing the general entry-level skills of non-CO-OP high school graduates and CO-OP students, 52.2% of the total employer sample did not respond because they were unable to make a comparison of CO-OP to non-CO-OP for a specific job. In most cases this is because a CO-OP student was the only individual to hold the position that was in question. Of the remaining 47.5% who were able to

compare, 58.6% felt the CO-OP student had better entry-level skills. The CO-OP student seemed to have a greater interest in the job, was more eager to learn, and possessed basic knowledge about the job. Students acted as a postive influence on other employees by virtue of their inquiries and desire to learn the job.

Table 5, page 20 breaks down the entry level skills into individual job skills (common to all programs) and personality traits. Employers were asked to compare two entry level employees -- one who had CO-OP training and one who had not -- using the individual characteristics. Of the employers surveyed 12.5% did not respond to this question because only CO-OP students had performed the particular job being evaluated (i.e. filing clerk, shop helper).

In comparing CO-OP to Non-CO-OP all responses were overwhelmingly in favor of the CO-OP student. When comparing the difference between CO-OP and Non-CO-OP, employers felt that the CO-OP student definitely made a difference. Of the total responses, over half (57.6%) of the employers did feel that the CO-OP student exhibited more knowledge of the job than the Non-CO-OP employee. Most felt that the basic knowledge gained in the classroom,including PEL, helped to prepare the student for entry level employment in their respective fields.

The quality of work performed (56.4%) as well as the student's willingness to learn (56.1%) were found to be better with the CO-OP student. The nature of the CO-OP program in requiring a satisfactory grade to remain in the program may be a reason why the CO-OP student was rated high in these factors. In most cases the employers felt that the students' motivation for learning about the job was sincere. Comments such as, "the CO-OP student does a better job", or "the CO-OP student is more concerned about doing the job correctly", were frequently recorded.

Over half of the employers (55.8%) felt that the CO-OP student was more dependable than the Non-CO-OP. This is an important factor for employers especially when considering part-time workers. Employers felt they could really count on the CO-OP student in terms of attendence. The only exception is the safety factor in which 51.6% felt there was no difference between the two.

Employers reasons for hiring CO-OP students were varied. Of the coded responses 48.1% of the employers participated in CO-OP programs because of the availability of qualified help. CO-OP students come to the training station with basic entry-level skills and are considered an asset to the part-time work force. CO-OP students fill the gap for the afternoon part-time demand. However, some employers would like to have the students available during morning hours when their demand is greater.

Of the employers surveyed 46.9% stated they were involved in CO-OP programs because they felt good about providing a valuable community service. It seemed that these individuals enjoyed "teaching someone how to do something" and watching the students grow. These employers were excited about cooperative education and their contribution to the program and the student's success.

The employers (32.6%) felt that involvement in CO-OP training was a means of providing them with a valuable source of potential, permanent employees. These students become eligible for management training and promotional opportunities. It also helped eliminate (screen out) those who were not interested in a particular job or career direction.

Responses to the "other" category were varied. Generally speaking, the majority of them related back to the teacher-coordinator. Unsolicitied comments concerning the advantages of involvement in CO-OP programs revealed a strong sense of

satisfaction with the program when the teacher coordinator was performing his/her job efficiently. The instructor who pre-screened students carefully and who acted as liaison between student and employer was highly reveered. Employers felt that students were successful because support from the teacher-coordinator was strong.

It can be assumed that employers are satisfied with their involvement in cooperative training programs since 57.6% stated there are no major obstacles to participating in CO-OP programs. The disadvantage mentioned most often related to the rigidity in the student's hours. Employers would rather the student be available not only in the afternoon, but in the morning as well. However, all employers who mentioned this felt that it was not a "major obstacle". Since they were aware of the students' schedule prior to hiring them, they were willing to work around the schedule and accomodate the needs of the student's schedule.

Perhaps, most significant of all findings relating to employers is that 97.0% surveyed stated they would continue to hire CO-OP students.

Interpretation of Teacher Data

The responses to the most effective type of training question indicated that the teacher sample selected the combination PEL/CO-OP program with the most frequency. Some statements in support of combination were: "gives the teacher time to develop postive student work attitudes sooner;" "provides better knowledge of their employability skills for CO-OP placement; gives students time to mature and become oriented to the requirements of the specific instructional area."

Table 7, page 22 revealed that teachers considered CO-OP students as having developed mature attitudes towards work and having career goals, while PEL/CO-OP student demonstrated interest in school with the most frequency.

The majority of teachers surveyed (71%) felt that the employers' contribution to cooperative education was important. Teachers indicated that they value suggestions from employers concerning curriculum update and student evaluations.

Feedback from employers and former students were perceived as the most frequently used assessments of program effectiveness. The feedback process by employers was provided in the form of unsolicated request for students when job openings become available. The student feedback came from follow-up contact and students voluntarily returning to visit with the teacher to share the progress they had achieved in their chosen career area.

Interpretation of Student Data

The student survey instrument was designed to try to measure students perceptions of employability and career potential based on the type of vocational training experienced. The sample represented programs completers who graduated from the 1982-83 class. Table 7 page 22 presents the completers who responded to the telephone questionnaires by type of training experienced: CO-OP 62.0%; PEL 8.0%; and PEL/CO-OP 30.0% for 100% total of the 226 sample. In addition they were asked to identify the instructional program area in which they they had received their training. (See Table 7 page 22) In order to compare the effects of training in relation to employability the ratio of the total currently employed to total sample resulted in 93% (employability rate). The combined

percentage ratio for full-time employed in the same and different field as training received was 57%; part-time employed was 30%. The discrepency between the total percentage employed to the total of part-time and full-time employed is due to the qualified responses of those who were attending school full-time. Some reported in both categories as they viewed themselves as full-time employed during vacations and/or summers and part-time employed either after classes and/or weekends.

Regarding the length of time employed in present job, there was a 53% response rate to greater than 12 months at present job; 14% for 6-12 months; 10% for 3-6 months; 10% less than 3 months; and other categories 13% respectively. The latter (13%) also includes responses by full-time and part-time students. Some of the responses by students were job employment at a different site during the school year and another job during vacations and/or summers; or having been employed either full-time or part-time for a year or so prior to their present enrollment in an educational activity.

Completers were asked if they had learned new skills since completing CO-OP training. The purpose of this line of inquiry was to gain insight as to the continued skills development of the person in relation to career potential. An illustration of this was indicated by having received training for the attainment of higher levels (i.e. management training) of employment within the organization. More than 76.1% respondents indicated that they had learned new skills on the job since completing CO-OP. More than forty 40.1% reported that it was on-going and the balance of percentages fell into a range of time elements from one day to greater than three months; 73.5% of the time it took place

on-the-job; and 72.1% were recipients of full pay. Since the question was asked of all sample participants the percentages include PEL and/or PEL/CO-OP student completers. To the question of current involvement in training the 76% negative responses reflected the more informal on-going nature of learning new skills in contrast to formalized training. The one area of employment that indicated the latter type were those employed in the banking industry. These were sent to the banking institute for seminars and/or to update skills on new machines or computer programs.

Responses to the question of program effectiveness in preparation for job revealed comments concerning the effectiveness of the teacher-coordinator rather than the program itself. The majority of students (96.0%) felt they received average or better preparation for their job (refer to Table 10, page 23). Respondents felt that the most valuable feature of their vocational training was the help they received in overcoming shyness. The fact that they learned basic job skills in the classroom and brought them to their place of employment helped students feel more sure of themselves during their initial employment experiences. CO-OP students who had received training in PEL before their first job experience expressed greater confidence in their skills during initial entry into the world of work.

Students were asked to comment on their perceptions of vocational program features that were either "helpful" or "not helpful". Eighty-percent of the responses indicated that at least some aspect of the program was helpful. Some random sample responses from each type of training were; "the teacher was significant; getting along with others; club participation by helping overcome shyness; getting into the world of work; knowledge

of scientific vocabulary helped in first year biology studies; familiarity with office machines; job interviewing skills; telephone etiquette; and one-on-one interest by the teacher."

When respondents were asked about type of training experience relative to helping in determining career goal the result was a description of the present employment situation. This indicated a lack of understanding of the "career goal" concept. It was necessary for the interviewers to probe beyond the immediacy of the moment in order to ascertain long range career plans. The answers clustered into three main categories; confirmed goal; helped to revise initial goal, based on the training experienced, to a different area; or had determined goal before entering the vocational program. The question addressing educational activities revealed that 50.0% of the sample were presently involved in post-secondary schooling. Those who decided to go on to post-secondary, four-year education indicated that the training experience provided them with employment skills. This gave them the opportunity to either supplement parental support or to be totally self-supporting in pursuing an undergraduate degree. They further related that although the training was different than the ultimate career goal that knowledge of basic job skills would always be an asset to employment and in their perspective professional pursuit.

Student suggestions for improving the quality of training were requested. The majority of comments made reinforced the effectiveness of the training, i.e. "...leave the program as is". VOE students recommended more training in computers and word processing.

The 98% positive response rate recommending the training to other high school students indicated that overall the training programs were viewed favorably, even in those cases in which negative responses were given to prior questions. Explanations given were: "exposure was helpful to the reality of the working world while in high school; helped financially; and turned me around about quitting school." All 98% had recommended the program either to siblings, relatives and/or friends.

CONCLUSIONS

Data findings and unsolicited comments seem to indicate that employers have a positive feeling toward vocational education since 88% surveyed have been involved in cooperative training for at least 3 years. Continuing support of the programs has been established as well because 97% of the employers surveyed stated they would continue to be involved in cooperative training programs.

Another indication of employers' support of cooperative training is the finding that approximately 84% of those surveyed try to keep CO-OP students on as regular employees after they have graduated. Many times the student is then qualified to move into a higher position within the organization's hierarchy. Often an employer will encourage a student to seek higher education relating to the existing job. This possibly explains the high percentage (50%) of students who indicated they were currently involved in post-secondary educational activities.

In all personality and job factors the employee with CO-OP training rated higher than the employee who had not received CO-OP training (except for the safety factor). Not only do employers feel that cooperative training programs provide them with qualified help, they also feel they are providing a valuable community service.

In general, employers would be distressed if the emphasis on vocational education programs was reduced or abolished. This is reinforced by the fact that the majority of them are willing to train students and keep them on as regular employees.

Data collected from teachers seems to reinforce the student responses concerning the effectiveness of the combination PEL/CO-OP in preparing students for employment.

Data indicated that 71% of the teachers felt that the employers' contribution to cooperative education is essential for maintaining an optimal program. Similarly, employers feel that an effective and quality eacher-coordinator is the reason for program and student success. Employers were able to identify good and poor teachers which seemed to correlate with their feelings about the programs.

Students were more outspoken about teacher incompetence than were employers. It seemed that when the teacher was perceived as poor, so was the student's experience with the program.

Data seems to indicate that students are satisfied with the vocational training they received. It helped them to find direction and to learn to cope with the world of work. Even though 27% were employed in a different field from their vocational training, they felt they gained valuable experience in the program which helped them make choices about their careers.

When questioned about the relevance of vocational training to their career goals, students made comments about their existing job. Many of them had no concept of a career, let alone how vocational training fit into the scheme of the career goal. This may indicate that the students' motivation for involvement in vocational training was not to lead them toward their predetermined career goal; instead, it seemed to be something to do that might be fun or interesting. It is recommended that vocational education place more emphasis on career as opposed to a job.

Some students were involved in vocational training as a means to earn money. This enabled them to remain in school. Some students who were not college-bound before involvement in vocational training were encouraged by their success in the program. Not only did they

complete high school, but many went on to college as a result of vocational training. This is reinforced by the fact that 50% of those surveyed went on for post-secondary education within 2 years after completing high school.

A great number of students commented that they had located their own job and then informed the teacher-coordinator. Many times the teacher told them to find a job before they would be eligible for the program. This seems to be in conflict with the concept of cooperative training. Programs could be enhanced if the teacher-coordinator first locates qualified training stations in which to place students according to their career objectives. If a student locates his/her own job, it should be pending the teacher's evaluation of the training station. This will ensure that the student will be "in training" not just "working".

Teachers indicated that the most effective type of training for preparing students for entry-level employment was PEL/CO-OP. This was reinforced by students in VOE, ICT, and HOE programs who felt that PEL helped to prepare them for their CO-OP jobs and helped them to gain entry-level skills. Students who went directly into CO-OP without PEL felt the transition would have been easier had they first been exposed to PEL.

Concerning recommendations for program improvement, many students suggested that the 2nd year CO-OP class be made more relevant to their needs and that 1st and 2nd year CO-OP classes be separate. Second year CO-OP students felt bored and would like to have discussed employee/employer relations during that time. Students in VOE suggesteed that the laboratory equipment be updated to keep pace with the real work environment.

Positive comments from students concerning their vocational training included interpersonal skills development and involvement in club actitivies. Students gave the impression that the club activities were important for gaining experience, training and maturity.

In general, the data seems to indicated that the vocational training programs are adequately preparing students for entry-level employment.

REFERENCES

American Vocational Assoication. (1968). Definitions of terms in vocational, technical, and practical arts education. Author.

Babbie, E. R. (1973). Survey research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Bell, T. H. (1984). Vocational education and the education reform movement. Voc Ed. p. 33-34.

Borman, C., Colsen, S., Cox, M. & Herring. D. (1981). The high school student in the working world. Austin: Texas Education Agency.

Brockman, L. O. (1972). Cooperative work experience education: A study in success, 26-40 years later. Lewistown, MA: Lewistown Public Schools.

Grusy, W. A. (1975). The relative effectiveness of two approaches to preparing vocational office education students for employment in office occupations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station.

Houstman, J. (1972). The future of vocational office and distributive education as perceived by state supervisors and teacher educators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Texas Education Agency. (1984 b). Unit allocation system, secondary vocational units, 1983-1984 (Computer printout). Austin, TX.

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (1984). Selecting young workers: The influence of applicants' education and skills on employability assessments by employers. Columbus, OH.

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (1984). Youth's perceptions of employer standards: Effects on employment outcomes and employer evaluations. Columbus, OH.

Zimmer, K. (1968). Cooperative part-time programs: Strenths of the past and present. National Business education yearbook, No. 6: Business education, and evaluative inventory. Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX A

Employer Survey/Telephone Script

EMPLOYER SURVEY/TELEPHONE SCRIPT

Name of Interviewer _____ (1) Date of Interview: _____

ISD _____ (2-6) Total Time: _____ (in mins.) (7-8)

Comments: _____

_____

MAY I PLEASE SPEAK WITH _____. THIS IS _____
(insert supervisor's name) (9-11)

_____ CALLING FROM TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.
(interviewer's name)

I HAVE A SCHEDULED TELEPHONE APPOINTMENT WITH _____.
(supervisor's name)

HELLO, _____. THIS IS _____
(supervisor's name) (interviewer's name)

FROM TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY. I AM CALLING CONCERNING THE TELEPHONE SURVEY WHICH HAS BEEN SCHEDULED FOR THIS TIME. MAY WE PROCEED? TO ANSWER SEVERAL OF THE QUESTIONS, YOU WILL BE REQUIRED TO USE A FIVE ITEM SCALE. TO EXPEDITE THE SURVEY PROCESS WOULD YOU PLEASE WRITE DOWN THIS SCALE? WE WILL REFER TO IT PERIODICALLY DURING THE SURVEY.

VERY HIGH IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE	IMPORTANT	LOW IMPORTANCE	VERY LOW IMPORTANCE

1. DO YOU NOW OR HAVE YOU DIRECTLY SUPERVISED CO-OP STUDENTS? (12)
   a (1) YES
   b (2) NO

2. HOW MANY EMPLOYEES ARE AT THIS LOCATION? _____ (13-16)

   OTHER LOCATIONS? _____ (17-20)

3. HOW MANY YEARS HAS YOUR FIRM HIRED HIGH SCHOOL CO-OP STUDENTS?

a (21) 1 year
b (22) 2 years
c (23) 3 years
d (24) 4 years
e (25) 5 years
f (26) More than 5 years

4. HOW MANY HIGH SCHOOL CO-OP STUDENTS HAVE YOU EMPLOYED IN THE LAST 5 YEARS? _____
27-29

5. APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY OF THE CO-OP STUDENTS YOU EMPLOYED STAYED ON WITH YOUR FIRM AS REGULAR EMPLOYEES?

a (30) 21 - 25
b (31) 16 - 20
c (32) 11 - 15
d (33) 6 - 10
e (34) 0 - 5

6. HAVE YOU RECENTLY EMPLOYED HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES WHO HAVE NOT PARTICIPATED IN THE CO-OP PROGRAM?
35
a (1) YES
b (2) NO

HOW DID THEIR ENTRY LEVEL SKILLS COMPARE WITH STUDENTS WHO WERE UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION DURING THEIR CO-OP TRAINING?

c (36) Skill levels of both were the same
d (37) Non-COOP students had better skills
e (38) CO-OP students had better skills
f (39) Other

7. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING QUALITIES, ACCORDING TO THE SCALE?

VERY HIGH IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE	IMPORTANT	LOW IMPORTANCE	VERY LOW IMPORTANCE
5	4	3	2	1

a (40) PERSONALITY TRAITS (e.g. PUNCTUALILITY) _____

b (41) SKILLS ON THE JOB _____

8. QUESTION #8 CONTAINS 9 CHARACTERISTICS THAT DEAL WITH PERSONALITY TRAITS AND JOB SKILLS. FOR EACH CHARACTERISTIC, COMPARE 2 ENTRY LEVEL EMPLOYEES WHO DO THE SAME WORK -- ONE WHO HAS HAD CO-OP TRAINING AND ONE WHO HAS NOT. WOULD YOU RATE THE CO-OP STUDENT OR THE NON-CO-OP STUDENT BETTER, OR IS THERE NO DIFFERENCE IN THE TWO?

	CO-OP 3	NON-CO-OP 4	NDD * 5
a (42) JOB KNOWLEDGE			
b (43) QUALITY OF WORK PERFORMED			
c (44) DEPENDABILITY			
d (45) WORK OUTPUT			
e (46) COMMUNICATION SKILLS			
f (47) PROPER USE OF FACILITIES, TOOLS, AND EQUIPMENT			
g (48) COOPERATIVENESS			
h (49) WILLINGNESS TO LEARN			
i (50) LEVEL OF SUPERVISION REQUIRED			
j (51) SAFETY			

* No distinguishable difference

9. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERSTICS THAT CO-OP STUDENTS NEED TO DEVELOP WHILE TRAINING IN YOUR FACILITY? (PLEASE USE THE SCALE FOR EACH CHARACTERSTIC)

a (52) COMMUNICATION SKILLS
b (53) COOPERATIVENESS
c (54) DEPENDABILITY
d (55) JOB KNOWLEDGE
e (56) LEVEL OF SUPERVISION REQUIRED
f (57) PROPER USE OF FACILITIES, TOOLS, AND EQUIPMENT
g (58) QUALITY OF WORK PERFORMED
h (59) SAFETY
i (60) WILLINGNESS TO LEARN
j (61) WORK OUTPUT

10. MOST EMPLOYERS CLAIM THAT THERE ARE ADVANTAGES TO BEING INVOLVED IN CO-OP PROGRAMS. PLEASE STATE 3 REASONS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE VOCATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAM.

a (64) Provides a valuable community service
b (65) Makes schools more responsive to the needs of business
c (66) Is good for public relations
d (67) Availability of qualified help
e (68) Improves communications with school
f (69) Cost of recruiting new employees is reduced
g (70) Employee turnover is reduced
h (71) Former CO-OP students demonstrate a more positive sense of responsibility to the organization
i (72) Reduced wage expense
j (1) Provides a valuable source for potential employees
k (2) Other_____

_____

_____

11. CAN YOU THINK OF ANY MAJOR OBSTACLES TO PARTICIPATING IN THE CO-OP PROGRAM?

a (3) Paperwork requirements (e.g. weekly performance appraisal)
b (4) High turnover
c (5) Too much time spent in training
d (6) Restricted pool of applicants
e (7) Interference from teacher/coordinator
f (8) Disruptive to operations
g (9) Students have not yet developed adult worker attitudes
h (10) There are no obstacles to participating in the CO-OP program
i (11) Other _____

_____

_____

12 WERE YOU INFORMED ABOUT YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS A JOB TRAINING SUPERVISOR?

12

a (1) YES
b (2) NO

COMMENT: _____

_____

13. WOULD YOU LIKE TO CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE IN CO-OP PROGRAMS?

13

a (1) YES
b (2) NO

WHY or WHY NOT? _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B
Teacher Survey

TEACHER SURVEY

Interviewer _____ (1) Date _____

Name of School _____ (2) School District _____ (3 - 7)

Instructional Area _____ (8 - 9) Teacher Name _____ (10 - 12)

(13) CO-OP _____ (3) PEL _____ (4) PEL/CO-OP _____ (5)

1. THERE ARE 3 ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS COMMON TO ALL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ACCORDING TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION CURRICULUM GUIDE. PLEASE RANK EACH IN TERMS OF THEIR IMPORTANCE IN PREPARING STUDENTS FOR EMPLOYMENT.

   (14) LEADERSHIP SKILLS AND CONCEPTS
   (15) CONCEPTS AND SKILLS RELATING TO SUCCESSFUL EMPLOYMENT
   (16) CONCEPTS AND SKILLS ASSOCIATED WITH ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Important	Extremely Important	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Least Important
3	5	4	2	1

2. WHICH PROGRAM DO YOU FEEL BEST PREPARES STUDENTS FOR ENTRY LEVEL EMPLOYEMNT?

   (17) CO-OP ONLY
   (18) PEL ONLY
   (19) PEL AND CO-OP COMBINED

   20 PLEASE EXPLAIN: _____

   _____

   _____

3. DETERMINE IF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS IS MORE APPROPRIATE FOR

   (3) CO-OP STUDENTS
   (4) PEL STUDENTS
   (5) BOTH PEL AND CO-OP STUDENTS
   (6) NON-PARTICIPATING STUDENTS
   (7) ALL OF THE ABOVE

   (21) SHOW INITIATIVE
   (22) HAVE A POSITIVE ATTITUDE
   (23) SHOW INTEREST IN SCHOOL
   (24) ACCEPT CRITICISM BETTER
   (25) ARE GENERALLY BETTER GROOMED
   (26) DEMONSTRATE MATURE SOCIAL SKILLS
   (27) HAVE MATURE ATTITUDES TOWARDS WORK
   (28) ARE MORE CERTAIN OF CAREER GOALS

29
4. PLEASE RANK THIS STATEMENT:

THE EMPLOYER IS A PARTNER IN THE COOPERATIVE EDUCATION ENDEAVOR AND CAN OFFER ADVICE AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPORTANT CHANGES OR NEEDED INNOVATIONS IN CURRICULUM.

AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	MILDLY AGREE	MILDLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
3	5	4	2	1

30 - 31
5. NAME SOME OF YOUR STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPING SUCCESSFUL EMPLOYER/PROGRAM RELATIONSHIPS.

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. HOW DO YOU ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF YOUR PROGRAM? (Check all that apply)

(32) Determine number of students employed in same field as CO-OP/PEL post graduation
(33) Number of students employed prior to graduation in field of training
(34) CO-OP employer feedback
(35) Community feedback in general
(36) Performance on written and practical tests
(37) Feedback from former students
(38) Number of former students enrolled in Junior, Technical or 4-year colleges or universities
(39) Other _____

_____

40
7. PLEASE RATE THIS STATEMENT.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS PROJECTS ARE IMPORTANT AS A LEARNING ACTIVITY DURING SCHOOL TIME.

AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	MILDLY AGREE	MILDLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
3	5	4	2	1

41
8. PLEASE RATE THIS STATEMENT.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENT PROJECTS ARE IMPORTANT AS A LEARNING ACTIVITY AS AN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITY.

AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	MILDLY AGREE	MILDLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
3	5	4	2	1

42
9. ARE THERE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BETWEEN YOUR PROGRAM AND SIMILAR ONES AT THE LOCAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE?

43
(1) YES
(2) NO

PLEASE IDENTIFY IN WHAT WAYS THIS IS ACHIEVED?

(45) Sharing of facilities
(46) Wavering of prerequisites
(47) Competency testing
(48) Other_____

_____

ARE ANY ACTIVITIES IN THE PLANNING STAGE?

44
(1) YES
(2) NO

WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE INDIVIDUAL WITH WHOM YOU COORDINATE THESE ACTIVITIES?

_____

_____

10. ARE THERE STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATE IN VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTIONAL CLASSES ON THE CAMPUS(ES) OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES?

49
(1) YES
(2) NO

PLEASE EXPLAIN _____

_____

_____

11. ARE JOINT PROGRAMS SPONSORED BY THE HIGH SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SUCH AS A CAREER DAY OR JOB FAIR?

50
(1) YES
(2) NO

PLEASE EXPLAIN _____

_____

_____

51 - 52

12. IDENTIFY THE CRITERIA THAT SHOULD BE USED TO DETERMINE THE NEED FOR A PRE-EMPLOYMENT LABORATORY PROGRAM IN YOUR INSTRUCTIONAL AREA.

_____

_____

_____

_____

53 - 55

13. DO YOU HAVE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING CO-OP, PEL or COMBO?

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

Student Survey/Telephone Script

Student Survey/Telephone Script (Write in Date and Time) 1st Try ___ 2nd Try ___ 3rd Try ___

Name of Interviewer _____ Date of Interview _____
1

ISD _____
2-6

Time Begun _____ Time Ended _____ Total Time _____
7-8

Name of Student _____ Student Phone # _____
9-11

Comments: _____

_____

**********ALL WORDS IN CAPITALS TO BE SPOKEN BY INTERVIEWER **********

MAY I PLEASE SPEAK WITH _____. If student answers go to next page.
(Student's name)

** If answer is, "Person is not at home and/or will return later" say WHEN WILL BE THE BEST TIME TO CALL BACK?

_____. THANK YOU.
(write in day, time)

*** If response is "Person is no longer at this number" say DO YOU KNOW THE NUMBER AT WHICH HE/SHE CAN BE REACHED?

If answer is "Yes", record new telephone number: _____

If answer is "No", say SORRY TO DISTURB YOU. THANK YOU.

Comments _____

_____

HELLO. MY NAME IS _____. I AM REPRESENTING TEXAS A&M
(interviewer)
UNIVERSITY. YOUR NAME WAS GIVEN TO US BECAUSE YOU COMPLETED
VOCATIONAL TRAINING AT _____. YOUR HELP IS
(name of school)
NEEDED IN RESPONDING TO A QUESTIONNAIRE REGARDING YOUR VOCATIONAL
TRAINING IN HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUR EXPERIENCES AFTER YOU COMPLETED THE
PROGRAM. ALL OF THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY
CONFIDENTIAL. DO YOU HAVE TIME TO ANSWER A FEW QUESTIONS?

STUDENT SURVEY

For questions 1 and 2 please CIRCLE all appropriate responses.

12-14

1. Verify the student's participation in the program by

   saying, YOU WERE IN THE :

CO-OP	PEL	COMB	VOE	M/DE	AG	T&I	HO	HECE
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11

15

2. HOW MANY SEMESTERS DID YOU SPEND IN THE PROGRAM?

1	2	3	4	JR.	SR.
(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)

3. WHAT ARE YOU DOING NOW?

3.1 ( ) ARE YOU WORKING IN SAME FIELD AS PEL/CO-OP?

16
(1) Yes
(2) No (Go to 3.2)

3.2 ( ) ARE YOU WORKING IN A DIFFERENT FIELD FROM PEL/CO-OP EXPERIENCE?

17
(1) Yes
(2) No (Go to 3.3)

IN WHAT FIELD ARE YOU CURRENTLY EMPLOYED?

_____
18-23

(a) ARE YOU EMPLOYED FULL TIME? ____ OR PART TIME? ____
4 5

(b) HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN EMPLOYED IN YOUR PRESENT JOB?

24
(4) Less than 3 months
(5) 3 - 6 months
(6) 6 -12 months
(7) Greater than 12 months

HOW LONG WERE YOU EMPLOYED IN YOUR PREVIOUS JOB?

25
(4) Less than 3 months
(5) 3 - 6 months
(6) 6 - 12 months
(7) Greater than 12 mons.

(c) HAVE YOU LEARNED ANY NEW SKILLS ON THE JOBS SINCE COMPLETING CO-OP?

26
(1) Yes
(2) No - Go to (e)

HOW HAVE YOU LEARNED THESE NEW SKILLS?

27
(3) Formal training by employer - go to (d)
(3) Self-taught - Go to (e)

(d) HOW MUCH TIME DID IT TAKE?

28
(4) 1 - 2 weeks
(5) 2 - 4 weeks
(6) 1 - 3 months
(7) Greater than 3 months
(8) On-going

WHERE DID THE TRAINING TAKE PLACE?

29
(4) On the job
(5) Away from the job facility

WHO PAID FOR THE ADDITIONAL TRAINING?

30
(4) Company
(5) Myself

(e) ARE YOU NOW RECEIVING ADDITIONAL TRAINING FOR YOUR JOB?

31
(1) Yes
(2) No

HOW MUCH TIME DO YOU EXPECT IT TO TAKE?

32
(4) 1 - 2 weeks
(5) 2 - 4 weeks
(6) 1 - 3 months
(7) Greater than 3 months

WHERE IS THE TRAINING TAKING PLACE?

33
(4) On the job
(5) Away from the job facility

WHO IS PAYING FOR THE ADDITIONAL TRAINING?

34
(6) Company
(7) Myself

3.3 ARE YOU CURRENTLY INVOLVED IN ANY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES?

35
(1) Yes
(2) No Go to 3.4

36
(4) FULL TIME?
(5) PART TIME?

IN WHAT TYPE OF INSTITUTION?

37
(6) 4 year
(7) 2 year
(8) Technical
(9) Other

NAME OF INSTITUTION? _____ 38-44

WHAT IS YOUR MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY?

_____ 45-48

ARE YOU CURRENTLY INVOLVED IN A CO-OP PROGRAM?

49
(1) Yes
(2) No

WHAT TYPE? _____ 50-57

_____

WHAT FIELD? _____ 58-61

_____

Go to 4

*****Only ask 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 if negative responses have been received up to this point ****

3.4 ARE YOU CURRENTLY IN THE MILITARY SERVICE?

62
(1) Yes Go to 4
(2) No Go to 3.5

3.5 ARE YOU UNEMPLOYED?

63
(1) Yes Go to 4
(2) No Go to 3.6

3.6 OTHER -- PLEASE DESCRIBE _____
64

_____

65
4. ON THE FOLLOWING SCALE, HOW WELL DID PEL/CO-OP PREPARE YOU FOR ENTERING YOU PRESENT JOB?

EXCELLENT PREPARATION	ABOVE AVERAGE PREPARATION	AVERAGE PREPARATION	BELOW AVERAGE PREPARATION	POOR PREPARATION
5	4	3	2	1
(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)

66
COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

5. IDENTIFY FEATURES OF THE PROGRAM(S) THAT WERE MOST EFFECTIVE IN PREPARING YOU FOR EMPLOYMENT. CO-OP PEL PEL/CO-OP
68 3 4 5
COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

6. WERE THERE FEATURES OF THE PROGRAM(S) THAT WERE LESS HELPFUL IN PREPARING YOU FOR EMPLOYMENT: (1) YES (2) NO

CO-OP 3 PEL 4 PEL/CO-OP 5

_____

_____

_____

7. COMMENT ON HOW YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH PEL/CO-OP OR COMBINATION HELPED YOU IN DETERMINING YOUR CAREER GOAL. _____

_____

10-19

_____

_____

8. CAN YOU MAKE SUGGESTIONS THAT WOULD HELP IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF PEL/CO-OP OR COMBINATION? _____

_____

20-29

_____

9. WOULD YOU RECOMMEND PEL/CO-OP OR COMBINATION TO OTHER HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS?

30
(1) Yes (2) No

PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY? _____

31-36

_____

_____

10. CO-OP Students, only, ask: WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE FIRST EMPLOYER WHO HIRED YOU DIRECTLY FROM HIGH SCHOOL?

Name _____

37-48

Address _____

49-60

Tel. # _____

61-70

Supervisor _____

11. PEL or Combination students, only, ask: WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE FIRST EMPLOYER WHO HIRED YOU DIRECLTY FROM HIGH SCHOOL?

Name _____
71-8

Address _____
9-20

Tel. # _____
21-30

Supervisor _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP